REMARKS

Twenty-eight claims are pending in the present Application. Claims 1-28 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 1, 17, and 21 are amended in the present Response. Reconsideration of the Application in view of foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 to Ludtke (hereafter Ludtke). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

"For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. §102, every element of the claimed invention must be *identically* shown in a single reference." *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1315, 1317 (CAFC 1988). The Applicant submits that Ludtke fails to identically teach every element.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 17, and 21, Applicants respond to the Examiner's §102 rejection as if applied to amended independent claims 1, 17, and 21 which now recite similar additional limitations. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite *"utilizing said individual triggering time for each device to perform said scheduled action, at least one of said plurality of devices not being a display device,"(emphasis added)* which are limitations that are not taught or suggested either by the cited reference, or by the Examiner's citations thereto. Ludtke discloses that all networked devices are

display devices.

In addition, Applicant maintains that independent claims 1, 17, and 21 recite an electronic network that is *"implemented with different types of consumer electronic devices in a home environment"*, which are limitations that are also not taught or suggested either by the cited reference or by the Examiner's citations thereto. Independent claim 26 recites similar limitations and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Ludtke essentially teaches dividing video frames into subsections and simultaneously displaying the subsections on multiple adjacent display devices that are arranged in a contiguous array (see column 3, line 11 to column 4 line 59). Ludtke is therefore limited to displaying *image data* on a plurality of the *same type of devices* (display devices). Furthermore, the device "latency" discussed in Ludtke is the essentially same for all the display devices.

In contrast, Applicant discloses and claims an electronic network that is implemented with different types of electronic devices of which at least one is not a display. In addition, Applicant discloses and claims "calculating an individual triggering time for each device" and "utilizing said individual triggering time for each device . . . to perform said scheduled action."

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to argue that Ludtke teaches the possibility of implementing the multiple adjacent display devices as different display types. However, in claims 1, 17, and 21, Applicant recites a different device type and a different device functionality. Applicant submits that the limitation "device type" is not the same as the different display

type mentioned in Ludtke. Applicant therefore submits that independent claims 1, 17, and 21 are not anticipated by Ludtke.

Dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, and 22-25, and 27 are directly or indirectly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested. Therefore, the limitations of these dependent claims, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claim 6, Applicant submits that Ludtke nowhere teaches or discloses that "every device" (i.e., Ludtke's display devices) "calculates its individual trigger time itself," as claimed by the Applicant. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 22-25, and 27.

Because a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that every claimed limitation be *identically* taught by a cited reference, and because the Examiner fails to cite Ludtke to identically teach or suggest the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-27.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 14, 16, 21-23, 25-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,466,971 to Humpleman et al. (hereafter Humpleman). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Humpleman has a filing date of May 7, 1999. Without a priority claim, Humpleman is therefore not prior art with respect to Applicant's present

Application 09/754,160, which has a priority date of July 9, 1998. However, Humpleman claims priority in Provisional Patent Application 60/084,578 (hereafter '578) that has a filing date of May 7, 1998. In other words, from the priority chain of Humpleman, only Provisional Patent Application '578 is prior art with respect to Applicant's present Application.

After review of the '578 disclosure, Applicant respectfully traverses the current rejection of claims 1-28 over Humpleman. "For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. §102, every element of the claimed invention must be *identically* shown in a single reference." *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1315, 1317 (CAFC 1988). The Applicant submits that '578 fails to identically teach every element of the claimed invention.

For example, '578 fails to teach "*a clock device for utilizing said first device triggering information to activate said first network device, and for utilizing said second device triggering information to activate said second network device to thereby accurately perform said scheduled action of said electronic network,*" as disclosed in independent claim 17. Independent claims 1, 21, and 26 recite similar limitations and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 14, 16, 22-23, 25, and 28 are directly or indirectly dependent from respective independent claims whose limitations are not identically taught or suggested. Therefore, the limitations of dependent claims 14, 16, 22-23, 25, and 28, when viewed through or in combination with the limitations of the respective independent claims, are also not identically taught or suggested.

Because a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that every claimed limitation be *identically* taught by a cited reference, and because the Examiner fails to validly cite Humpleman to identically teach or suggest the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 14, 16, 21-23, 25-26, and 28.

Summary

Applicant submits that the foregoing remarks overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102. Because the cited references, or the Examiner's citations thereto, do not teach or suggest Applicant's claims, and in light of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited prior art, Applicant therefore submits that Applicant's claims are patentable over the cited art, and respectfully requests the Examiner to allow claims 1-28. If there are any questions concerning this amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/21/06

By: _____

Gregory J. Koerner, Reg. No. 38,519
Redwood Patent Law
1291 E. Hillsdale Blvd., Suite 205
Foster City, CA 94404
Tel.: (650) 358-4000